UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/826,702	04/05/2001	Dae-Suk Chung	AUS920010189US1	3977

7590 05/04/2004

Frank C. Nicholas
CARDINAL LAW GROUP
1603 Orrington Avenue, Suite 2000
Evanston, IL 60201

EXAMINER	
CASIANO, ANGEL L	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2182	2

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

P126

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/826,702	Applicant(s) CHUNG, DAE-SUK	
	Examiner Angel L. Casiano	Art Unit 2182	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 April 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *05 April 2001* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The present Office action is in response to application filed 05 April 2001.

2. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to because:

- Figure 5, black box "555" should be labeled as to its function
- Figure 5, "572" should read "FDD" (see Page 8, line 3).

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

4. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

5. Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:
(1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
(2) if an article, its method of making;
(3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
(4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
(5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

6. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

7. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is merely a short recitation of claim 1. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international

application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 1-3, 9, 13-14, 17, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gupta [US 6,212,565 B1].

Regarding claim 1, Gupta teaches a *method* for saving a network address (see Abstract). In addition, the prior art teaches selecting a network address, acquiring a truncated (see "root") address from the network address and copying to a computer usable medium (see Abstract; col. 3, lines 38-62).

Claim 13 corresponds to the *system* for saving a network address for implementing the method of claim 1. Claim 19 is directed to the *computer-usable medium* storing a computer program having instructions corresponding to the method in claim 1. These claims are rejected under the same basis

As for claim 2, the prior art teaches the steps of "acquiring" and copying" as performed without user intervention (see "automatically", col. 3, lines 58-62; col. 7, line 65).

Claim 14 corresponds to the *system* for saving a network address for implementing the method of claim 2. Claim 20 is directed to the *computer-usable medium* storing a computer program having instructions corresponding to the method in claim 2. These claims are rejected under the same basis

As for claim 3, Gupta teaches the network address viewed using a network browser (see col. 1, line 36; col. 5, line 7).

As for claim 9, Gupta teaches manipulating attributes associated to the truncated (see "root") address (see Abstract; Figure 8). Claim 17 corresponds to the *system* for saving a network address for implementing the method of claim 9. This claim is rejected under the same basis

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 4-5, 6-8, 11-12, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta [US 6,212,565 B1] in view of Osaku et al. [US 6,061,738].

As per claims 4 and 5, Gupta does not teach placing the copied root address into a *bookmark folder* or into a *subfolder* within the bookmark folder. However, Osaku et al. teaches that "it is common for computer users to store a URL in a computer file generally known as a bookmark" (see col. 1, lines 27-30). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to

modify the method disclosed by Gupta by including bookmark folder/subfolder, in order to use it "for accessing a particular home page" in the future (see Osaku et al., col. 1, lines 29-30).

As per claims 6-8, Gupta does not explicitly teach a method including the steps of "checking the existence of an autosave folder within the bookmark folder", "creating the autosave folder", and "placing the copied root address into the autosave folder". Osaku et al. teaches that "it is common for computer users to store a URL in a computer file (folder) generally known as a bookmark" (see col. 1, lines 27-30). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the cited disclosures in order to obtain a folder, "for accessing a particular home page" in the future (see Osaku et al., col. 1, lines 29-30). Nonetheless, this folder is not disclosed at "autosave". Regarding this limitation, Gupta suggests a folder on a computer usable medium, since it teaches *storing* (saving) *the network address* (see col. 7, lines 1-8). Figure 6 (Gupta) teaches the steps of accessing a page in response to an *automatic* request (see col. 7, lines 65-66). Claims 15-16 correspond to the *system* for saving a network address for implementing the method of claims 6-7. These claims are rejected under the same rationale.

As per claims 11 and 12, Gupta does not explicitly teach a method containing the steps of "appending the copied network address to a network address list" and "providing connectivity between the network address list and a network address". Instead, Osaku et al. teaches storing the network address in a list and providing connectivity with a network browser (see Abstract; col. 1, lines 66-67; col. 2, lines 15-19). Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the cited disclosures in order to "facilitate accessing network home

pages through URL's" (see Osaku et al., col. 1, lines 61-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that a "network address list" would have provided future reference to a user, and therefore facilitated network access.

12. Claims 10 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta [US 6,212,565 B1] in view of Todokoro [WO 200108358 A1].

As per claim 10, Gupta does not explicitly teach a method including the step of "checking for a new network address connection". Todokoro teaches checking and detecting a new connection to a network (see Abstract). At the time of the invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the cited references in order to obtain a method and system in which a network address is automatically given to a new network element connected (see Todokoro).

Claim 18 corresponds to the *system* for saving a network address for implementing the method of claim 10. This claim is rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- Liu [US 20020138648 A1] teaches saving a source network address.
- Oshimi [JP 2001175595 A] teaches recording designated URLs and/or e-mail addresses.
- Chae et al. [KR 2001040075 A] teaches an address-saving Internet connecting method and apparatus.

- Goudreau [EP 1063827 A2] teaches storing network addresses.
- Tange [US 6,483,525 B1] teaches saving a URL address.
- Nakatsugawa [US 6,272,135 B1] teaches a data communication method used to execute data exchange between a plurality of networks.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angel L. Casiano whose telephone number is 703-305-8301. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin can be reached on 703-308-3301. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

alc
28 April 2004

JEFFREY GAFFIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100